

Letter of Findings Number: 03-20150188
Withholding Tax
For Tax Years 2011-13

NOTICE: IC § 6-8.1-3-3.5 and IC § 4-22-7-7 require the publication of this document in the Indiana Register. This document provides the general public with information about the Department's official position concerning a specific set of facts and issues. This document is effective as of its date of publication and remains in effect until the date it is superseded or deleted by the publication of another document in the Indiana Register. The "Holding" section of this document is provided for the convenience of the reader and is not part of the analysis contained in this Letter of Findings.

HOLDING

Employer did not make a coherent argument regarding its protest that withholding tax was not due. Therefore, Employer's protest of the imposition of withholding tax did not prove the Department's proposed assessments for withholding tax wrong.

ISSUES

I. Withholding Tax—Imposition.

Authority: IC § 6-8.1-5-1; Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar, Inc., 15 N.E.3d 579 (Ind. 2014); Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East, Inc., 963 N.E.2d 463 (Ind. 2012); Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue, 867 N.E.2d 289 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007); Wendt LLP v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue, 977 N.E.2d 480 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2012); [45 IAC 3.1-1-97](#).

Taxpayer protests the imposition of withholding tax.

II. Tax Administration—Penalties and Interest.

Authority: IC § 6-8.1-10-1; IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1; [45 IAC 15-11-2](#).

Taxpayer protests the imposition of penalties and interest.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Taxpayer is an Indiana business. As the result of an audit for withholding tax covering the tax years 2011, 2012, and 2013, the Indiana Department of Revenue ("Department") determined that Taxpayer had not remitted withholding tax to account for minimum wage payments to staff its businesses for all hours those businesses were open. The Department therefore issued proposed assessments for withholding tax, penalties, and interest for those years. Taxpayer protests those adjustments. An administrative hearing was held and this Letter of Findings results. Further facts will be supplied as required.

I. Withholding Tax—Imposition.

DISCUSSION

Taxpayer protests the imposition of withholding tax for the tax years 2011-13. The Department based its proposed assessments on the grounds that the wages reported by Taxpayer did not include sufficient employees and hours to operate two convenience stores. The Department consulted a well-known data source known as "Bizstats.com" to determine the average number of employees and the number of hours worked by those employees for two convenience stores of this type. After finding those numbers, the Department recalculated the amount which Taxpayer should have withheld and subtracted the amount which Taxpayer was able to verify it actually withheld. What was left was considered as the amount under-withheld by Taxpayer.

As a threshold issue, it is the Taxpayer's responsibility to establish that the existing tax assessment is incorrect. As stated in IC § 6-8.1-5-1(c), "The notice of proposed assessment is prima facie evidence that the department's claim for the unpaid tax is valid. The burden of proving that the proposed assessment is wrong rests with the person against whom the proposed assessment is made." Indiana Dept. of State Revenue v. Rent-A-Center East,

Inc., 963 N.E.2d 463, 466 (Ind. 2012); Lafayette Square Amoco, Inc. v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue, 867 N.E.2d 289, 292 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2007). Consequently, a taxpayer is required to provide documentation explaining and supporting his or her challenge that the Department's position is wrong. Further, "[W]hen [courts] examine a statute that an agency is 'charged with enforcing. . . [courts] defer to the agency's reasonable interpretation of [the] statute even over an equally reasonable interpretation by another party.'" Dept. of State Revenue v. Caterpillar, Inc., 15 N.E.3d 579, 583 (Ind. 2014). Thus, all interpretations of Indiana tax law contained within this decision, as well as the preceding audit, shall be entitled to deference.

The relevant regulation is [45 IAC 3.1-1-97](#), which states in relevant part:

Employers who make payments of wages subject to the Adjusted Gross Income Tax Act, and who are required to withhold Federal taxes pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code (USC Title 26), are required to withhold from employees' wages Adjusted Gross and County Adjusted Gross Income Tax.

Therefore, employers such as Taxpayer are required to withhold adjusted gross and county adjusted gross income tax from payments of wages made to its employees.

Taxpayer protests the imposition of additional withholding taxes. However, Taxpayer merely repeats what the audit report says in its explanation of how and why it made adjustment to Taxpayer's reported withholding. Taxpayer provided no argument on this issue. Therefore, Taxpayer has not presented a sufficiently developed argument for the Department to address. See *Wendt LLP v. Indiana Dept. of State Revenue*, 977 N.E.2d 480, 485 n.9, (Ind. Tax Ct. 2012) (stating in a footnote parenthetical "that poorly developed and non-cogent arguments are subject to waiver" by the Indiana Tax Court) (citing *Scopelite v. Indiana Dep't of Local Gov't Fin.*, 939 N.E.2d 1138, 1145 (Ind. Tax. Ct. 2010)).

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest is denied.

II. Tax Administration—Penalties and Interest.

DISCUSSION

Taxpayer protests the imposition of penalties pursuant to IC § 6-8.1-10-2.1 and the imposition of interest pursuant to IC § 6-8.1-10-1. The Department notes that waiver of interest is not permitted under IC § 6-8.1-10-1(e). Penalty waiver is permitted if the taxpayers show that the failure to pay the full amount of the tax was due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect. [45 IAC 15-11-2\(b\)](#) clarifies the standard for the imposition of the negligence penalty as follows:

"Negligence", on behalf of a taxpayer is defined as the failure to use such reasonable care, caution, or diligence as would be expected of an ordinary reasonable taxpayer. Negligence would result from a taxpayer's carelessness, thoughtlessness, disregard or inattention to duties placed upon the taxpayer by the Indiana Code or department regulations. Ignorance of the listed tax laws, rules and/or regulations is treated as negligence. Further, failure to read and follow instructions provided by the department is treated as negligence. Negligence shall be determined on a case by case basis according to the facts and circumstances of each taxpayer.

The standard for waiving the negligence penalty is given at [45 IAC 15-11-2\(c\)](#) as follows:

The department shall waive the negligence penalty imposed under [IC 6-8.1-10-1](#) if the taxpayer affirmatively establishes that the failure to file a return, pay the full amount of tax due, timely remit tax held in trust, or pay a deficiency was due to reasonable cause and not due to negligence. In order to establish reasonable cause, the taxpayer must demonstrate that it exercised ordinary business care and prudence in carrying out or failing to carry out a duty giving rise to the penalty imposed under this section. Factors which may be considered in determining reasonable cause include, but are not limited to:

- (1) the nature of the tax involved;
- (2) judicial precedents set by Indiana courts;
- (3) judicial precedents established in jurisdictions outside Indiana;
- (4) published department instructions, information bulletins, letters of findings, rulings, letters of advice, etc;
- (5) previous audits or letters of findings concerning the issue and taxpayer involved in the penalty

assessment.

Reasonable cause is a fact sensitive question and thus will be dealt with according to the particular facts and circumstances of each case.

Taxpayer protests the Department's assessment of penalties and interest. After review of the documentation and analysis provided in the protest process, the Department may not waive interest, as provided by IC §6-8.1-10-1(e). Taxpayer has provided no argument to support its mere assertion that it does not owe additional withholding taxes. Taxpayer has not affirmatively established that it exercised ordinary business care in this case. Therefore, waiver of penalties is not warranted under [45 IAC 15-11-2\(c\)](#).

FINDING

Taxpayer's protest to the imposition of penalties and interest is denied.

SUMMARY

Taxpayer's Issue I protest regarding the imposition of withholding tax is denied. Taxpayer's Issue II protest regarding the imposition of penalties and interest is denied.

Posted: 02/24/2016 by Legislative Services Agency

An [html](#) version of this document.